

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Milton O. Crawford,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No.: 2:12-cv-0122-GMN-GWF
vs.)	
)	ORDER
Smith's Food and Drug Centers, Inc., <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Pending before the Court are three Motions, (ECF Nos. 234, 235, 241), filed by *pro se* Plaintiff Milton O. Crawford requesting that the Court reconsider numerous Orders, enter judgment in his favor, and issue sanctions against the Defendants in this case.¹ Defendants Smith’s Food & Drug Centers, Inc. (“Smith’s”) and the Kroger Company (“Kroger”) have filed Responses, (ECF Nos. 237, 242), and Plaintiff filed a Reply. (ECF No. 244).²

Plaintiff filed his original Complaint on January 23, 2012, which set forth claims for, *inter alia*, intentional infliction of emotional distress, harassment, defamation, employment discrimination, retaliation, and wrongful termination against Defendant Smith's. (Compl. 3:12-16, ECF No. 1-1). On May 10, 2012, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint, naming Kroger Company ("Kroger") as an additional defendant. (Am. Compl., ECF No 16). Pursuant to the parties' stipulated Scheduling Order, discovery in this case was originally scheduled to close on January 14, 2013. (Sched. Order 2:12-17, ECF No 51).

On February 28, 2014, after Plaintiff consistently failed to cooperate with discovery

¹ Despite the fact that Plaintiff's Motions request relief under various Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, they each request reconsideration of the Court's prior rulings. Therefore, the Court construes all of them as Motions to Reconsider.

² In light of Plaintiff's status as a *pro se* litigant, the Court has liberally construed his filings, holding them to standards less stringent than formal pleadings drafted by attorneys. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).

1 requests in defiance of the Court's Orders, Magistrate Judge George Foley issued a Report and
2 Recommendation stating that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint should be dismissed with
3 prejudice. (Rep. & Rec., ECF No. 194). On April 9, 2014, the Court adopted Judge Foley's
4 Report and Recommendation and dismissed the Amended Complaint with prejudice. (ECF No.
5 201). On that same day, the Court entered a Judgment in favor of Defendants as to all of
6 Plaintiff's claims. (ECF No. 202).


7 Since that time, *pro se* Plaintiff has filed no less than eight Motions for Reconsideration
8 in this case. (ECF Nos. 203, 204, 205, 218, 219, 220, 234, 235). On October 6, 2014, the Court
9 issued an Order, (ECF No. 216), discussing why reconsideration was not warranted and
10 denying the first three of Plaintiffs' Motions. Because the instant Motions merely rehash
11 arguments that have already been addressed by the Court, they will be denied. Furthermore, in
12 light of the large number of repetitive Motions filed by Plaintiff in this action, the Court finds
13 that deeming Plaintiff a vexatious litigant is warranted. Plaintiff shall be required to submit a
14 written request for leave from the Court prior to filing any additional Motions in this action.
15 Any request for leave must be clearly labeled as a "Motion for Leave to File," must not exceed
16 two pages, and must outline the substance of the Motion that Plaintiff wishes to file with the
17 Court.

18 Accordingly,

19 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motions, (ECF Nos. 234, 235, and 241),
20 are **DENIED**.

21 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff is deemed a vexatious litigant, and that any
22 future Motions filed by Plaintiff in this action shall be summarily denied unless Plaintiff has
23 been given express leave from the Court to file them.

24 **DATED** this 28th day of July, 2015.

25 

Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
United States District Court